



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/661,962

09/12/2003

Sabeer Bhatia

406293

8569

30955

7590

06/24/2008

LATHROP & GAGE LC
4845 PEARL EAST CIRCLE
SUITE 300
BOULDER, CO 80301

EXAMINER

ANWAH, OLISA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/661,962	Applicant(s) BHATIA ET AL.	
	Examiner OLISA ANWAH	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2008.
 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7, 27, 35 and 39-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-26, 28-34 and 36-38 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/19/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prahlad et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,107,298 (hereinafter Prahlad) in view of Raghunandan, U.S. Patent No. 7,136,897 (hereinafter Raghunandan).

Regarding claim 38, Prahlad discloses a method for automatically managing dynamic mailboxes, comprising:

obtaining configuration information from one or more dynamic mailboxes;

purging all expired messages of the dynamic mailboxes; and
archiving messages of the dynamic mailboxes that (a) substantially exceed a predetermined memory allocation and (b) have not been accessed by a subscriber for a predetermined time period (see column 7).

Further regarding claim 38, Prahlad does not explicitly teach compressing non-purged and non-archived messages of the dynamic mailboxes. At any rate, Raghunandan discloses this feature (see Figure 2). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Prahlad with compressing non-purged and non-archived messages of the dynamic mailboxes as taught by Raghunandan. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by minimizing electronic mailbox congestion as suggested by Raghunandan.

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fortman et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,115,455 (hereinafter Fortman) combined with Prahlad in further view of Raghunandan.

Regarding claim 1, Fortman discloses a method for exchanging messages between users, comprising:

processing messages from a plurality of user networks having a plurality of network protocols, for storage in a message store; and

Art Unit: 2614

accessing at least one of the messages in the message store from one of the user networks having any one of the network protocols (see Figures 7 and 8).

Further regarding claim 1, nowhere does Fortman disclose: obtaining configuration information about a mailbox for organizing at least one of the messages in the message store; purging all expired messages of the dynamic mailboxes; and archiving messages of the dynamic mailboxes that (a) substantially exceed a predetermined memory allocation and (b) have not been accessed by a subscriber for a predetermined time period.

In any event, Prahlad discloses these limitations (see column 7). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fortman with the system and method for archiving objects in an information store as taught by Prahlad. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by enabling users to manage a large volume of message traffic as suggested by Prahalad (see column 1).

Further regarding claim 1, the combination of Fortman and Prahlad does not explicitly teach compressing non-purged and non-archived messages of the dynamic mailboxes. Regardless, Raghunandan discloses this feature (see Figure 2). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Fortman and Prahlad with compressing non-purged and non-archived messages of the dynamic mailboxes as taught by Raghunandan. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by minimizing electronic mailbox congestion as suggested by Raghunandan.

Regarding claim 2, see Figure 5 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 3, see Figure 7 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 4, see Figure 7 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 5, see column 5 of Fortman.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fortman combined with Prahlad and Raghunandan in further view of Picard, U.S. Patent No. 6,115,455 (hereinafter Picard).

Regarding claim 6, although Fortman discloses the step of processing comprises associating one or more of the messages

Art Unit: 2614

with a subscriber (see Figure 7), nowhere do the primary references disclose:

- determining whether the subscriber has an existing mailbox;
- if the subscriber has the existing mailbox, storing the one or more messages in the existing mailbox; and
- if the subscriber does not have the existing mailbox, creating a new mailbox and storing the one or more messages in the new mailbox.

At any rate, Picard covers these features (see Figure 2). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the primary references with the method and apparatus for dynamically creating message mailboxes as taught by Picard. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by saving resources as suggested by Picard (see column 1).

5. Claims 30-34, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picard in view of Joong et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,188,887 (hereinafter Joong).

Regarding claim 30, Picard discloses a method for processing dynamic mailboxes, comprising:

- associating a message with a subscriber;

Art Unit: 2614

determining whether the subscriber has an existing mailbox;
if the subscriber has the existing mailbox, storing a
voicemail message from the telephone call in the existing
mailbox; and

if the subscriber does not have the existing mailbox,
creating a new mailbox and storing the voicemail message in the
new mailbox (see Figure 2).

Still on the issue of claim 30, Picard fails to teach
determining whether the subscriber is roaming and replicating
the subscriber's mailbox at a remote location if the user is
roaming. All the same, Joong discloses this limitation (see
Figure 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of
ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to
modify Picard with the distributed data storage of Joong. This
modification would have improved the system's efficiency by
eliminating the need for a store and forward operation as
suggested by Joong (see column 2).

Regarding claim 31, see Figure 2 of Picard.

Regarding claim 32, see Figure 2 of Picard.

Regarding claim 33, see Figure 2 of Picard.

Regarding claim 33, see Figure 2 of Picard.

Regarding claim 34, see Figure 2 of Picard.

As per claim 36, Picard as modified by Joong inherently discloses the step of replicating comprises synchronizing servers between a home location of the subscriber's mailbox and the remote location.

As per claim 37, Picard as modified by Joong inherently discloses the step of replicating comprises copying the subscriber's mailbox to the remote location.

5. Claims 8-16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fortman in view of Joong.

Regarding claim 8, Fortman discloses a communications system for exchanging messages between users, comprising:

- a first messaging store (see unit 330 from Figure 3) for storing the messages;

- a first messaging server (see unit 340 from Figure 3) for accessing messages of the first message store; and

- at least one first server (see unit 320 from Figure 3) for interfacing between the messaging server and user networks such that the messages are exchanged between the users, via the first

Art Unit: 2614

messaging server and the first messaging store, even if the user network employs a plurality of protocols.

Again on the issue of claim 8, nowhere does Fortman disclose:

a second messaging store for storing replicas of one or more of the messages;

a second message server for accessing replica messages of the second messaging store; and

at least one second server for interfacing between the second messaging server and the user networks such that the replica messages are exchanged between the users, and via the second messaging server and the second message store, even if the user networks employ a plurality of protocols; the second messaging store, second messaging server and second server being located at a roaming node that is different from a home node of the first messaging store, the first messaging server and first server, wherein a roaming subscriber communicating with the roaming node has access to messages sent to the first server and intended for the roaming subscriber.

At any rate, Joong discloses these features (see Figure 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

Art Unit: 2614

in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fortman with the distributed data storage of Joong. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by eliminating the need for a store and forward operation as suggested by Joong (see column 2).

Regarding claim 9, see Figure 2 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 10, see Figure 5 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 11, see Figure 5 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 12, see Figure 5 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 13, see Figure 5 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 14, see Figure 5 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 15, see Figure 2 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 16, see Figure 5 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 18, see Figure 7 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 21, see Figure 6 of Fortman.

Regarding claim 23, Fortman fails to teach a first billing/reporting server for creating and storing CDRs. All the same, Joong discloses this feature (see column 8). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fortman with a first billing/reporting server for creating and storing CDRs as taught

Art Unit: 2614

by Joong. This modification would have improved the system's profitability by enabling the service provider to charge fees for rendered services.

Regarding claim 25, see column 5 of Fortman.

As per claim 26, Fortman as modified by Joong inherently discloses a first synchronization server synchronizing messages at different nodes of the user networks.

On the issue of claim 28, the combination of Fortman and Joong does not clearly teach deleting the replica messages when the roaming subscriber returns to the home node. "Official Notice" is taken that this limitation is both old and well known in the art. For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Fortman and Joong with deleting the replica messages when the roaming subscriber returns to the home mode. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by saving precious memory space.

As per claim 29, Fortman as modified by Joong inherently discloses a first synchronization server at the home node and a

second synchronization server at the roaming node, the first and second synchronization servers being synchronized over a network such that messages and user profile information is replicated for the roaming subscriber at the roaming mode.

6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fortman combined with Joong in further view of Rhee, U.S. Patent No. 5,524,137 (hereinafter Rhee).

Regarding claim 22, the combination of Fortman and Joong does not explicitly mention a first directory/authentication server for authenticating access to the messages in cooperation with the first messaging server. Yet, Rhee discusses this limitation (see Figure 3). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Fortman and Joong with the login and password of Rhee. This modification would have improved the system's reliability by providing security.

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fortman combined with Joong in further view of Kuter et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,876,729 (hereinafter Kuter).

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Fortman and Joong does not clearly teach the first message store indexes the messages. Nevertheless, Kuter discloses this limitation (see abstract). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Fortman and Joong wherein the first message store indexes the messages as taught by Kuter. This modification would have improved the system's user-friendliness by enabling a user to find a specific piece of information within a message as taught by Kuter (see column 2).

8. Claims 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fortman combined with Joong in further view of Zirngibl et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,829,334 (hereinafter Zirngibl).

Regarding claim 17, although Fortman discloses the messages being encapsulated in documents within the first message store (see Figure 7), neither Fortman nor Joong disclose the documents are XML documents. All the same, Zirngibl covers this feature (see Figure 4). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Fortman and Joong wherein the documents are XML documents as shown by Zirngibl. This

Art Unit: 2614

modification would have improved the system's user friendliness by delivering personalized information as suggested by Zirngibl (see column 5).

Regarding claim 19, nowhere does Fortman nor Joong disclose the first server comprising a first notification server for notifying subscribers of a newly activated service. Regardless, Zirngibl discloses this limitation (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Fortman and Joong with the notification of Zirngibl. This modification would have improved the system's user friendliness by delivering personalized information as suggested by Zirngibl (see column 5).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of Fortman and Joong fails to disclose the first server comprising a first notification server for prompting subscribers users for action. Even so, Zirngibl teaches such (see Figure 9). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Fortman and Joong with the prompts of Zirngibl. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by

Art Unit: 2614

enabling the subscriber to modify a subscription as suggested
Zirngibl (see column 7).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

Application/Control Number: 10/661,962

Page 16

Art Unit: 2614

Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
May 20, 2008

JA

Olisa Anwah